

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/982,992	10/22/2001	Joseph M. Patti	P06922US02/BAS	7767	
881 7590 08/20/2007 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER		
			HINES, JANA A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1645		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/982,992	PATTI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ja-Na Hines	1645		

	Ja-Na Hines	1645					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of example of the control of the expiration date of the let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late nave arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) 1.2710(C) 1.2710(	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	inlineith 27 OFD 44 27 m		ه - سه سطاه - مطاه م				
P. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 April 2007. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any replacements.	any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismis	sal of the				
B. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
I. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			<b>(</b>				
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None.							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None.</u> Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .			•				
Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,6-12,14,18,24-26 and 30-32.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 15-17,19-21 and	<u>27</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N ad sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because;				
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		**				
13.  Other:							
•	·						

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

The proposed after final amendment will not be entered because it raises issues of new matter and would require further search and consideration. The issues are drawn to the depositing of monoclonal antibody H07 having been deposited April 11, 2007 at ATCC. This appears to be new matter within the claims and specification. Therefore the proposed amendment would not be deemed as placing the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing the issues. Therefore the amendment will not be entered.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-12, 14, 18, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hook et al., (US Patent 5,648,240) in view of Kohler and Milstein (Nature, 1975. Vol. 256:495-497) is maintained for reasons already of record. The rejection is on the grounds that it would have been prima facie obvious at the time of applicants invention to modify the antibodies of Hook et al., ('240) to prepare or characterize the antibodies as monoclonal single chain antibody, humanized antibodies or fragments that have the same binding specificity as taught by Hook et al., ('240) since such techniques are well known in the art.

JEFFREY SIEW